

III. REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is amended. Claims 2 and 5 were previously canceled. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Brown et al. (US 6970918B2) (hereinafter referred to as "Brown").

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection over Brown, Applicant asserts that Brown does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*: "said proxy receiving said response over the Internet network and detecting at least one cookie in the response and storing the at least one cookie and an Internet address of the content server in a user context database and transmitting said response to said user over the Internet network after said cookie has been removed from said response." Brown does not teach this feature of applicant's invention.

As Brown discusses, "the process used in the preferred embodiment of the invention is depicted in FIG. 4." C.4 I.47-48. Reviewing the process disclosed by Brown in FIG. 4 and C.4 I.47 – C.6 I.42, Brown does not teach or suggest in reference

to a response "detecting at least one cookie in the response and storing the at least one cookie and an Internet address of the content server in a user context database."

Therefore, Brown does not teach each and every feature of applicant's invention, as amended.

Accordingly, claim 1, is not anticipated by Brown. Applicant asserts the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

With respect to the dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependent claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/David E. Rook/

Date: August 20, 2009

David E. Rook
Reg. No.: 40,790

Hoffman, Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)